

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND DIVISION**

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

NVIDIA CORPORATION,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:14CV757-REP

**PROPOSED JURY VERDICT FORM
ON ISSUES RELATING ONLY TO THE '602 PATENT**

Verdict Form

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

Continued on next page

Infringement

1. Did Samsung prove by a preponderance of the evidence that NVIDIA has infringed the following claims?

Answer “YES” or “NO” for each listed claim:

'602 Claim 3	no
'602 Claim 26	no
'602 Claim 27	no
'602 Claim 29	no

Invalidity

2. Did NVIDIA prove by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims are invalid as anticipated by the prior art?

Answer “YES” or “NO” for each listed claim:

'602 Claim 3	Yea
'602 Claim 26	no
'602 Claim 27	no
'602 Claim 29	no

3. Did NVIDIA prove by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims are invalid because they lack written description?

Answer “YES” or “NO” for each listed claim:

'602 Claim 3	no
'602 Claim 26	no
'602 Claim 27	no
'602 Claim 29	no

Damages

ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY FOR THOSE CLAIMS, IF ANY, THAT YOU FIND INFRINGED AND NOT INVALID:

4. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Samsung for NVIDIA's infringement of those claims, if any, that you find are infringed and not invalid?

Damages Awarded: \$ 10

Foreperson Signature
Sealed pursuant
to E Govt Act.

2/5/14
DATE

Dated: February __, 2016

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
BY COUNSEL

By: _____

Brian C. Riopelle (VSB No. 36454)
McGuireWoods LLP
Gateway Plaza
800 East Canal Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 775-1084
Facsimile: (804) 698-2150
E-mail: briopelle@mcguirewoods.com

Darin W. Snyder (Pro Hac Vice)
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
E-mail: dsnyder@omm.com

Vision L. Winter (Pro Hac Vice)
Ryan K. Yagura (Pro Hac Vice)
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
E-mail: vwinter@omm.com
E-mail: ryagura@omm.com

Marc J. Pensabene (Pro Hac Vice)
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
E-mail: mpensabene@omm.com

Robert W. McFarland (VSB No. 24021)
McGuireWoods LLP
101 W. Main Street, Suite 9000
Norfolk, Virginia 23510
Telephone: (757) 640-3716
Facsimile: (757) 640-3966
E-mail: rmcfarland@mcguirewoods.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February __, 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was filed electronically using the CM/ECF system. As such, this document was served on all counsel who have consented to electronic service, including as follows:

Dabney Jefferson Carr, IV
Troutman Sanders LLP
1001 Haxall Point
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: 804-697-1238
Facsimile: 804-698-5119
Email: Dabney.carr@troutmansanders.com

Maximillian Grant
Latham & Watkins LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-637-2200
Facsimile: 202-637-2201
Email: max.grant@lw.com

Clement Joseph Naples
Latham & Watkins LLP
885 Third Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: 212-906-1200
Facsimile: 212-906-1201
Email: clement.naples@lw.com

Counsel for NVIDIA Corporation

Brian C. Riopelle (VSB No. 36454)
McGuire Woods LLP
Gateway Plaza
800 East Canal Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 775-1084
Facsimile: (804) 698-2150
E-mail: briopelle@mcguirewoods.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.